



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

ruptcy where judgment, execution and levy were all within four months period. White, J. and Peckham, J., dissenting.

By Section 67 (f.) of the Bankruptcy Act, liens such as the one giving rise to the proceeds in question, are rendered null and void "in case the judgment debtor is adjudged a bankrupt." This decision of the Supreme Court defines this section to include the proceeds in the hands of the sheriff. "The invalidity relates back to the entry of the judgment and effects all subsequent proceedings." The money in the sheriff's hands takes the place of the property. *Balmer v. Balmer*, 2 Lanc. Law Review, II. "The rights of the creditor were still subject to interception," and the proceeds do not become his until paid over. *Baker v. Kenworthy*, 41 N. Y. 215. That the money in the sheriff's hands is "in custodia legis" and not subject to levy is almost universally held. *Turner v. Fendall*, 1 Cranch 116; *Conover v. Ruckman*, 32 N. J. Eq. 685; *Hardy v. Tilton*, 68 Me. 195, hand note. The provision in the section in question excepting bona fide purchasers only from its operation would seem to lead to a like conclusion. *In re Franks*, 95 Fed. 635. But the Supreme Court of New York, App. Div., held in a recent case that where the money was paid over it did not come within Section 67 (f.). *Levor v. Leitor*, 8 Am. B. R. 459. The dissent was apparently in accordance with this view and with certain recent New York decisions holding that property in the sheriff's hands belongs to the creditor. *Wehle v. Conners*, 83 N. Y. 231.

BANKS—AUTHORITY OF CASHIER—LIABILITY OF BANK.—TAYLOR v. COMMERCIAL BANK, 66 N. E. 726 (N. Y.)—*Held*, that in the absence of authorization, the cashier of a bank has no authority by virtue of his position to make any representation on behalf of the bank as to the solvency of a customer who is one of its debtors. Bartlett, O'Brien, and Vann, JJ., dissenting.

The rule is laid down in the lower court, 73 N. Y. Supp. 929, and supported by the dissenting opinion that a principal is liable to a third person for the fraud of his agent, perpetrated by the latter in the course of his employment, although the act was *ultra vires*, and the principal did not know of it. On the doctrine of *ultra vires* the decisions are conflicting. See cases cited in *Nowac v. Railroad Co.*, 166 N. Y. 44. Several recent cases seem to treat the misrepresentations of a cashier as governed by principles different from those applicable to other classes of agents. *Crawford v. Boston Store Mercantile Co.*, 67 Mo. App. 39; *First Nat. Bk. v. Marshall and Ilsley Bk.*, 83 Fed. 725. *Swift v. Jewsbury*, L. R. 9 Q. B. 301, cited by the dissenting judges does not appear to support their opinion. See also *Barwick v. English Joint Stock Bank*, L. R. 2 Exch. 259. The majority opinion is in accord with the weight of authority. *American Surety Co. v. Pauly*, 170 U. S. 133; *Mapes v. Sec. Nat. Bk.*, 80 Pa. 163; *Horrigan v. First Nat. Bk.*, 56 Tenn. 137.

BOUNDARIES—RIVERS—STATES—CONCURRENT JURISDICTION.—ROBERTS v. FULLERTON, 93 N. W. 1111 (Wis.)—An officer from Minnesota, acting under the laws of that State, seized plaintiff's fish net staked to the bottom of the Mississippi River on the Wisconsin side. In an action for damages, *held*, that the concurrent jurisdiction given by Congress over the